

Subject: FW: Professor Emeritus Hal Lewis Resigns from American Physical Society - Says Global Warming is a huge scam.

From: clintoncrackel@aol.com[SMTP:CLINTONCRACKEL@AOL.COM]

Sent: Friday, October 15, 2010 1:38:51 PM

To: BRC

Subject: Fwd: Professor Emeritus Hal Lewis Resigns from American Physical Society - Says Global Warming is a huge scam.

Tim:

This is very interesting. It has already been published in some media circles.

Subject: FW: Professor Emeritus Hal Lewis Resigns from American Physical Society - Says Global Warming is a huge scam.

A very sober, clear, and comprehensive resignation letter. This points out the world of Junk science that our best scientists have been forced to survive in.

How much Time, Energy and Money have been wasted in this attempt to enrich a bunch of liberal politicians?

=====
Sent: Friday, 08 October 2010 17:19 Hal Lewis
From: Hal Lewis, University of California, Santa Barbara
To: Curtis G. Callan, Jr., Princeton University, President of the American Physical Society
6 October 2010

Dear Curt:

When I first joined the American Physical Society sixty-seven years ago it was much smaller, much gentler, and as yet uncorrupted by the money flood (a threat against which Dwight Eisenhower warned a half-century ago).

Indeed, the choice of physics as a profession was then a guarantor of a life of poverty and abstinence—it was World War II that changed all that. The prospect of worldly gain drove few physicists. As recently as thirty-five years ago, when I chaired the first APS study of a contentious social/scientific issue, The Reactor Safety Study, though there were zealots aplenty on the outside there was no hint of inordinate pressure on us as physicists. We were therefore able to produce what I believe was and is an honest appraisal of the situation at that time. We were further enabled by the presence of an oversight committee consisting of Pief Panofsky, Vicki Weisskopf, and Hans Bethe, all towering physicists beyond reproach. I was proud of what we did in a charged atmosphere. In the end the oversight committee, in its report to the APS President, noted the complete independence in which we did the job, and predicted that the report would be attacked from both sides. What greater tribute could there be?

How different it is now. The giants no longer walk the earth, and the money flood has become the raison d'être of much physics research, the vital sustenance of much more, and it provides the support for untold numbers of professional jobs. For reasons that will soon become clear my former pride at being an APS Fellow all these years has been turned into shame, and I am forced, with no pleasure at all, to offer you my resignation from the Society.

It is of course, the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist. Anyone who has the faintest doubt that this is so should force himself to read the ClimateGate

documents, which lay it bare. (Montford's book organizes the facts very well.) I don't believe that any real physicist, nay scientist, can read that stuff without revulsion. I would almost make that revulsion a definition of the word scientist.

So what has the APS, as an organization, done in the face of this challenge? It has accepted the corruption as the norm, and gone along with it. For example:

1. About a year ago a few of us sent an e-mail on the subject to a fraction of the membership. APS ignored the issues, but the then President immediately launched a hostile investigation of where we got the e-mail addresses. In its better days, APS used to encourage discussion of important issues, and indeed the Constitution cites that as its principal purpose. No more. Everything that has been done in the last year has been designed to silence debate

2. The appallingly tendentious APS statement on Climate Change was apparently written in a hurry by a few people over lunch, and is certainly not representative of the talents of APS members as I have long known them. So a few of us petitioned the Council to reconsider it. One of the outstanding marks of (in)distinction in the Statement was the poison word incontrovertible, which describes few items in physics, certainly not this one. In response APS appointed a secret committee that never met, never troubled to speak to any skeptics, yet endorsed the Statement in its entirety. (They did admit that the tone was a bit strong, but amazingly kept the poison word incontrovertible to describe the evidence, a position supported by no one.) In the end, the Council kept the original statement, word for word, but approved a far longer "explanatory" screed, admitting that there were uncertainties, but brushing them aside to give blanket approval to the original. The original Statement, which still stands as the APS position, also contains what I consider pompous and asinine advice to all world governments, as if the APS were master of the universe. It is not, and I am embarrassed that our leaders seem to think it is. This is not fun and games, these are serious matters involving vast fractions of our national substance, and the reputation of the Society as a scientific society is at stake.

3. In the interim the ClimateGate scandal broke into the news, and the machinations of the principal alarmists were revealed to the world. It was a fraud on a scale I have never seen, and I lack the words to describe its enormity. Effect on the APS position: none. None at all. This is not science; other forces are at work.

4. So a few of us tried to bring science into the act (that is, after all, the alleged and historic purpose of APS), and collected the necessary 200+ signatures to bring to the Council a proposal for a Topical Group on Climate Science, thinking that open discussion of the scientific issues, in the best tradition of physics, would be beneficial to all, and also a contribution to the nation. I might note that it was not easy to collect the signatures, since you denied us the use of the APS membership list. We conformed in every way with the requirements of the APS Constitution, and described in great detail what we had in mind—simply to bring the subject into the open.

5. To our amazement, Constitution be damned, you declined to accept our petition, but instead used your own control of the mailing list to run a poll on the members' interest in a TG on Climate and the Environment. You did ask the members if they would sign a petition to form a TG on your yet-to-be-defined subject, but provided no petition, and got lots of affirmative responses. (If you had asked about sex you would have gotten more expressions of interest.) There was of course no such petition or proposal, and you have now dropped the Environment part, so the whole matter is moot. (Any lawyer will tell you that you cannot collect signatures on a vague petition, and then fill in whatever you like.) The entire purpose of this exercise was to avoid your constitutional responsibility to take our petition to the Council.

6. As of now you have formed still another secret and stacked committee to organize your own TG, simply ignoring our lawful petition. APS management has gamed the problem from the beginning, to suppress serious conversation about the merits of the climate change claims.

Do you wonder that I have lost confidence in the organization?

I do feel the need to add one note, and this is conjecture, since it is always risky to discuss other people's motives. This scheming at APS HQ is so bizarre that there cannot be a simple explanation for it. Some have held that the physicists of today are not as smart as they used to be, but I don't think that is an issue. I think it is the money, exactly what Eisenhower warned about a half-century ago. There are indeed trillions of dollars involved, to say nothing of the fame and glory (and frequent trips to exotic islands) that go with being a member of the club. Your own Physics Department (of which you are chairman) would lose millions a year if the global warming bubble burst. When Penn State absolved Mike Mann of wrongdoing, and the University of East Anglia did the same for Phil Jones, they cannot have been unaware of the financial penalty for doing otherwise. As the old saying goes, you don't have to be a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing. Since I am no philosopher, I'm not going to explore at just which point enlightened self-interest crosses the line into corruption, but a careful reading of the ClimateGate releases makes it clear that this is not an academic question.

I want no part of it, so please accept my resignation. APS no longer represents me, but I hope we are still friends.

Hal

=====

Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, former Chairman; Former member Defense Science Board, chmn of Technology panel; Chairman DSB study on Nuclear Winter; Former member Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Former member, President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee; Chairman APS study on Nuclear Reactor Safety Chairman Risk Assessment Review Group; Co-founder and former Chairman of JASON; Former member USAF Scientific Advisory Board; Served in US Navy in WW II; books: Technological Risk (about, surprise, technological risk) and Why Flip a Coin (about decision making)

Mike Davis

480-634-3388

It does not take a majority to prevail... but rather an irate, tireless minority, keen on setting brushfires of freedom in the minds of men.

Samuel Adams

This is the contents of an e-mail I recently sent to a candidate for the Arizona State Senate:

You opponent wants to promote renewable energy such as solar and wind. Well, check out the data below. Only advanced nuclear and geothermal have projected capacity factors of 90%.

Plus, take a look at the Total System Levelized Costs for nuclear versus wind and solar. Nuclear is by far the most reasonable in terms of costs.

Granted, wind generators produce no greenhouse gases but the emissions of such gases from the manufacturing of the metal components that go into the generators clearly need to be addressed. Also, consider the amount of greenhouse gas emitted by the manufacturing of photovoltaic cells, especially if natural gas is used as a fuel for the source of the heat in the manufacturing process. We also have to consider the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in the transportation of wind generator and solar components by vehicles burning petroleum products.

Wind generation is dependent on not only the wind but also on the speed of the wind. Slow winds will not turn the generators fast enough to generate enough electricity to transmit to the grid.

Solar generating systems typically generate electricity in a dc current that has to be converted to ac, thereby experiencing a power loss due to the conversion. Otherwise, homes and businesses using solar power have to be converted to dc. How much would it cost the average homeowner in your district to convert to dc appliances?

The only exception to the solar system is if the solar system is used to heat water or another liquid medium to convert is to steam to turn an ac generator. Even then, it would be necessary to find a medium for the storage of the heat at night to continue to create steam for a 24-hour per day operation. I believe you will find that's what brings the capacity factor rating down on such systems.

The table below lists the estimated cost of electricity by source for plants entering service in 2016. No [subsidies](#) are included in the calculations. The table is from a January 12, 2010 report of the [U.S. Department of Energy](#) (DOE).^[10]

- **Total System Levelized Cost** (the rightmost column) gives the dollar cost per [megawatt-hour](#) that must be charged over time in order to pay for the total cost. Divide by 1000 to get the cost per [kilowatt-hour](#). The easy way to do that is to move the [decimal point](#) 3 places to the left.

Estimated Levelized Cost of New Generation Resources, 2016.

Plant Type	Capacity Factor (%)	U.S. Average Levelized Costs (2008 \$/megawatthour) for Plants Entering Service in 2016				
		Levelized Capital Cost	Fixed O&M	Variable O&M (including fuel)	Transmission Investment	Total System Levelized Cost
Conventional Coal	85	69.2	3.8	23.9	3.6	100.4
Advanced Coal	85	81.2	5.3	20.4	3.6	110.5
Advanced Coal with CCS	85	92.6	6.3	26.4	3.9	129.3
Natural Gas-fired						
Conventional Combined Cycle	87	22.9	1.7	54.9	3.6	83.1
Advanced Combined Cycle	87	22.4	1.6	51.7	3.6	79.3
Advanced CC with CCS	87	43.8	2.7	63.0	3.8	113.3
Conventional Combustion Turbine	30	41.1	4.7	82.9	10.8	139.5
Advanced Combustion Turbine	30	38.5	4.1	70.0	10.8	123.5
Advanced Nuclear	90	94.9	11.7	9.4	3.0	119.0
Wind	34.4	130.5	10.4	0.0	8.4	149.3
Wind – Offshore	39.3	159.9	23.8	0.0	7.4	191.1
Solar PV	21.7	376.8	6.4	0.0	13.0	396.1
Solar Thermal	31.2	224.4	21.8	0.0	10.4	256.6
Geothermal	90	88.0	22.9	0.0	4.8	115.7
Biomass	83	73.3	9.1	24.9	3.8	111.0
Hydro	51.4	103.7	3.5	7.1	5.7	119.9

Source: Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2010, December 2009, DOE/EIA-0383(2009)

- **O&M** = [operation and maintenance](#).
- **CC** = [combined cycle](#).
- **CCS** = [carbon capture and sequestration](#).
- **PV** = [photovoltaics](#).
- **GHG** = [greenhouse gas](#).

The table, according to the DOE (**emphasis** added), "provides the average national levelized costs for the generating technologies represented in the [National Energy Modeling System](#) (NEMS) as configured for the Annual Energy Outlook 2010 (AEO2010) reference case. Levelized costs represent the present value of **the total cost of building and operating a generating plant over its financial life**, converted to equal annual payments and [amortized](#) over expected annual generation from an assumed duty cycle. The key factors contributing to levelized costs include the cost of constructing the plant, the time required to construct the plant, the non-fuel costs of operating the plant, the fuel costs, the cost of financing, and the utilization of the plant. The availability of **various incentives** including **state or federal tax credits** can also impact these costs. **The values shown in the table do not incorporate any such incentives.**"

Do to time constraints, I didn't have the opportunity to address the need for storage batteries for supplying dc to a home with dc appliances during the nighttime in the event a house had solar cells, not did I address the need to install an inverter for converting ac to dc in the event the house didn't have storage batteries and had to be supplied off the grid.

Do you ever get the feeling we're being sold a bill of goods?

Then again, I suppose beauty truly lies in the eye of the beholder:



Thanks for the invitation to meet with you on November 2nd.

Clint Crackel